

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

DANIEL STANTON,)	
)	
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	Civil No. 99-0248-P
)	
K. HANDCOCK, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants)	

RECOMMENDED DECISION

Plaintiff has filed a Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and has been granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Plaintiff's Complaint appears to allege that items have been removed from his mail. He does not attribute this property deprivation to any of the named Defendants, and does not present any other acts or omissions on the part of the Defendants which are alleged to have violated his rights. Further, there is no denial of due process if the state provides an adequate remedy. *Limerick v. Greenwald*, 749 F.2d 97, 99 (1st Cir. 1984). Plaintiff does not allege that there is no adequate state remedy. The undersigned is satisfied that Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted in this Court. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(b)(1).

Conclusion

Accordingly, I hereby recommend Plaintiff's Complaint be dismissed in its entirety.

NOTICE

A party may file objections to those specified portions of a magistrate judge's report or proposed findings or recommended decisions entered pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) (1988) for which *de novo* review by the district court is sought, together with a supporting memorandum, within ten (10) days of being served with a copy thereof. A responsive memorandum shall be filed within ten (10) days after the filing of the objection.

Failure to file a timely objection shall constitute a waiver of the right to *de novo* review by the district court and to appeal the district court's order.

Eugene W. Beaulieu
United States Magistrate Judge

Dated on: October 5, 1999